

***SEATTLE PACIFIC UNIVERSITY***  
***Major Institution Master Plan***  
***Standing Advisory Committee***

September 20, 2005 Draft

**April 26, 2005**  
**6:30 PM – 8:00 PM**  
(Approved \_\_\_\_\_)

**DRAFT MEETING NOTES**

**Committee Members Present:**

Martin Harper  
Darlene Hickman, Chair  
Douglas Jennings  
Elaine King  
Emily Evans  
Jay La Vassar  
John Coney  
Doug McNutt  
Kim Orr  
Tom Box  
Nancy Ousley

**Ex-Officio Members Present**

Darrell Hines, SPU  
Cliff Louie, DON

**Others Present**

Melanie Whitehead, SPU  
Dave Church, SPU  
Mark Reid, SPU  
Bill Fenimore, QA Resident  
Dave McDougal, QA Resident

**1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Darlene Hickman, Chair, opened the meeting at 6:30 PM and asked committee members, as well as community people in the audience, to introduce themselves. Darlene set out the ground rules for public comments, asking community people to reserve their comments at the end of the meeting, until business has been completed.

**2. APPROVAL OF DRAFT AGENDA**

Darlene had noted that there has been a change to the draft agenda. She asked committee members to insert, "Update on SPU Property Ownership Outside of Boundary," as the sixth agenda item. Followed by Traffic and Parking Update, as item 7 and Public Comment will be 8. Revised agenda was approved.

**3. SELECTION PROCESS FOR FUTURE MEETING DATES**

Cliff Louie provided a context for this agenda item. Doug Lorentzen, is the only committee member unable to attend tonight's meeting. He handed out a copy of an e-mail message dated April 25 sent by Doug Lorentzen. Cliff Louie elaborated that Melanie Whitehead had begun polling committee members about two months ago for a suitable date for a spring meeting and offered several potential dates to choose from.

Unfortunately, Doug Lorentzen was not available for any of the three dates that Melanie proposed to committee members. He had prior commitments for all three dates. Tonight he is meeting as a community volunteer as part of a larger committee to review Neighborhood Matching Fund applications, a program operated by the Department of Neighborhoods. Cliff Louie clarified the sentence, "It is as a rule city staff that determine the

dates and times.” for community meetings. It is our department’s policy not to set or determine when the meetings occur because we respect community volunteers’ time. For himself and other department staff, the dates and times for community meetings are usually set by neighborhood people to accommodate their schedules realizing they are volunteering their time. And we want to encourage their participation. For the Standing Advisory Committee meetings Cliff Louie, Darlene Hickman, Chair, and Melanie Whitehead create a list of possible meeting dates and poll members for their availability. Cliff Louie clearly stated that, at least for the Department of Neighborhoods, we do not determine the dates for community meetings, as Doug Lorentzen noted in his e-mail. He deferred to the committee to collectively decide when they would like to meet. The committee has always had a spring and fall meeting depending on the planned development projects.

Darrell Hines asked for clarification and stated if the committee wanted to set a date in advance that SPU would be OK with that option, or to continue its current process of choosing a meeting date.

Kim Orr did not think the process for selecting a meeting date was a problem. Doug Jennings concurred with Kim Orr. There will be times when some people will be unable to attend. Doug McNutt stated he liked the flexibility of selecting from three dates. He also noted if the meeting date is set in advance, he may not be able to attend all the meetings. Nancy Ousley stated that reserving the month of April and October is fine without specifying a particular date now. But allowing sufficient time so there is adequate time for public notice and other people who want to attend. Melanie Whitehead offered to get a City calendar to see what events or meetings may be occurring those months, so there would not be any possible conflicts. Darlene Hickman thought having access to a City calendar of events and meeting will not solve the problem because there are meetings every single night of the week. She thought a note could be included when the meeting minutes are sent out to alert committee members that the next meeting will occur in October. John Coney recommended for our neighborhood that Melanie contact Ellen Monrad, president of Queen Ann Community Council, for all the committee meeting dates. Darlene Hickman stated that many times it is a matter of making choices based on your priorities when one is involved in their community. She thanked committee members for attending tonight’s meeting. There was consensus that April and October were generally good months to set aside for meetings. After April 15 for the obvious reasons would be better stated John Coney.

#### **4. UPCOMING CHANGES IN SPU STAFF**

Darrell Hines announced that June 30 would be his last day with Seattle Pacific University. He is retiring. Dave Church and Melanie Whitehead will continue to work with this group. He thanked this group and called out specifically Jay LaVassar and Darlene Hickman, who were with the original group that help develop the master plan. He has been with the University for ten years and feels very positive about what has transpired over those years. When he began working with the University, he didn’t think it had an interest in developing a positive relationship with the community. Although some may say there are still concerns to be addressed. The desire on the part of the University is to be responsive and be a good neighbor. He pointed out the development projects – Emerson Hall and the new Science Building - were a result of the new master plan, and how this group monitored those projects. Darrell also mentioned significant renovations. He also talked about the Wesley Apartments at Cremona and Dravus. Darlene Hickman expressed her personal loss when he leaves.

#### **5. SPU PROJECT UPDATES**

- **The Wesley Student Apartments**

Dave Church provided the update for the Wesley apartments. With the handout distributed, he pointed out there are two buildings one facing W. Cremona Street and the second one facing W. Dravus Street. There are 40 apartments (with 133 beds) with 37 parking stalls underneath. The cars enter and exit off the alleyway. The apartments opened in the fall of 2004. Dave Church thought that the architect, Mithun, did an excellent job of modulating the exterior and he pointed out that there is a green space that acts as a buffer between the single family house and the Dravus Street apartment building.

- **Phase III Tiffany Loop Entry Project**

Dave Church also provided a handout for Phase III of the Tiffany Loop Entry Project with the first page showing the site location and the three different phases. The University has been working on the project for three years. He reviewed previous improvements – sidewalk improvements, three bollards, and installing a new paved loop - that have taken place. Phase III will be the installation of a gateway structure with metal lettering spelling out Seattle Pacific University over the entry way occurring in the summer of this year. He reviewed the handout in more detail with committee members, and mentioned that Department of Planning and Development have reviewed the plans. The handout included architectural drawings of the north elevation and structural details for its construction. Included in the attachments was a simulation once it was installed and what it would look like at night when lighted. And there is a landscape planting plan for the gateway project. Darrell Hines noted that at the base of the columns there could be a short history of the University or list of past presidents. Dave Church said this was project an attempt to re-create the historic gateway to the campus.

Jay LaVassar asked about pedestrian safety issues of crossing the street towards the gateway and lighting at night. Dave Church responded that at the intersection of where the gateway will be built, SDOT considers it a legitimate pedestrian crosswalk. Darrell Hines emphasized that the University will encourage pedestrians to use the southern side of the street to cross, and not the north side of the street, where there is an existing tree and new landscaping will discourage pedestrians from using that side of the intersection to cross. Dave Church thought people will still cross the street where they want to. There is an existing street light nearby. Nancy Ousley suggested a painted crosswalk citing the example at W. Bertona where SDOT painted one. Dave Church named several crosswalks where they made requests to SDOT to paint one, and even offered to pay for the paint. Mark Reid explained SDOT's rationale for not painting a crosswalk because pedestrians may have a sense of false safety and not look both ways as they begin to cross the street. Darrell Hines suggested if the group agrees about a painted crosswalk, then it should be a recommendation. John Coney suggested that a letter be written to Grace Crunican, director of SDOT, requesting a painted crosswalk with a cc to Pete Lagerwey, who is the manager for the pedestrian and bicycle program. Also he commended the efforts by SPU on its pedestrian design for 3<sup>rd</sup> and Bertona crossing. Nancy Ousley suggested putting Councilmember Richard Conlin on the cc list. Other crosswalks will be mentioned in the list for painted pedestrian crosswalks.

Jay LaVassar mentioned the need for a left turn channelization at 3<sup>rd</sup> and Nickerson because without one, traffic backs up. Darlene Hickman asked about the process to consider installing one. Cliff Louie explained the funding source, Cumulative Reserve Funds (CRF), and how neighborhood groups can suggested street improvement projects for this funding source to SDOT.

- **Classroom/Fine Arts Building**

The last handout given by Dave Church was for potentially building a classroom/fine arts building. He clearly stated that the handout is just a projected scenario of what could possibly fit on the site. He added that It does not necessarily reflect the exact footprint. One scenario under consideration is a three story building with approximately 40,500 square feet. The University's initial thoughts for this building is it would at first be for classrooms and offices, and perhaps over time transition into a fine arts building. Having 16' high ceilings, higher than normal, gives the University flexibility as a multi-purpose building. In the master plan the site was identified for potential development for a fine arts building, not performing arts. Darrell Hines elaborated a little more on this potential project. The University has some excellent programs and staff, but there is no facility for the fine arts.

Doug McNutt thought the site is a promising one because it would offer visibility and street presence to the University, and be an improvement over a parking lot. Another reason to build a facility on this site is to create a

“superblock” where students would not need to cross a street and it would possibly enhance the Loop area. He suggested maximizing the height of the building on site, and thereby preserving as much open space as possible.

#### **6. UPDATE OF SPU PROPERTY OWNERSHIP OUTSIDE OF BOUNDARY**

Melanie Whitehead gave the update of SPU property ownership outside of the MIO (Major Institution Overlay) boundary that is principally west of the campus. She noted that at the last SAC meeting Nancy Ousley had made this request for the next meeting. The University owns four properties all single-family homes. Two are near 8<sup>th</sup> and W. Cremona and were purchased specifically to provide transitional housing for new incoming faculty. Their stay is usually a year allowing them time to decide where they would like to permanently live. The other two structures are near 11<sup>th</sup> and Bertona and they are rental properties. Cornell & Associates currently manage them and non-SPU people are renting them.

Nancy Ousley, as well as other neighbors, are concerned about SPU “creeping” into the neighborhood. She proposed that it being a standing item on the agenda. Melanie Whitehead admits that SPU does receive calls from property owners wishing to sell. Darrell Hines thought Nancy’s request was reasonable to have on the agenda. He acknowledged that the University is interested in property inside the campus boundary. The reality is SPU doesn’t have money to build or to purchase property.

A recommendation, but not a condition for approval, during the review and approval period it that the University look to the east and north for future expansion, rather than west or south. And the University needs to get more dense – taller.

#### **7. TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING UPDATE**

- **Fremont Bridge Approach Replacement Project**

John Coney provided information about the Fremont Bridge Approach Replacement Project by SDOT. He summarized the 6 page handout. He emphasized it is the approaches, both north and south, to the bridge that need to be seismically upgraded with new pilings. Starting in March 2006 half of the lanes will be closed to traffic as the approaches are replaced. One of the biggest affects is to see more traffic along 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue W. There will be more pedestrian-vehicle conflicts on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue W. with increased traffic. There will be another bike lane added on the westbound side of NE 34<sup>th</sup> Street. It is the approaches to the bridge that were damaged by the 2001 earthquake.

- **Transportation Management Plan (TMP)**

Mark Reid, Director of Safety and Security for SPU, provided an update of the University’s TMP – Transportation Management Plan. He informed the committee that by State law any employer with 100 or more employees must develop a Trip Reduction Plan, and a similar City regulation. The one of the purposes of this regulation is to comply with the Clean Air Act. He had a slide presentation that illustrated the University’s TMP. The primary goal of the plan is to emphasize transportation alternatives to driving alone – single occupancy vehicle (SOV). There are challenges, e.g., not being close to a freeway, for SPU to persuade employees to use alternative modes of transportation. The transportation program alternatives that SPU offers its staff and faculty are six: bus passes (100% subsidy for 250 employees), car pools, van pools, bikes, walk to work and ride match. There are 60 employees who live nearby and walk to work. He spoke about the bicycling challenges about the Burke-Gilliam Trail not connecting with the Interbay Trail. John Coney mentioned that the Emerson Street viaduct bike trail will be connected to Fisherman’s Terminal leading to the Interbay Trail. Then he mentioned the connection with the Monorail when it is completed in 2009/2010.

Mark Reid noted that SPU has several promotions during the school year to encourage employees to use alternative transportation modes. And there is the ride match program to encourage staff to car pool.

Currently there are 705 commuter parking spaces and 523 residential parking spaces with 21 carpool spaces. We have increased our fees for parking last year and those revenues collected are used to subsidize bus transit and other programs. Last year the subsidy for bus transit for students was increased to encourage them to take the bus to school. We have increased the fines for parking violations.

Presently SPU has 382 staff commuters, who are full-time employees. Of this number 39 say they park on-street and 21 are in car pools. There are 809 student commuters. All new students and employees are informed of the various transportation modes during an orientation session. He explained the different subsidy programs: the flex pass (bus); monthly bus passes; bike to work program that provides shower facilities and lockers; vouchers for the Ferry system and Community Transit; car pools and van pools.

Jay LaVassar asked what is the current student enrollment. For 2005 there are 2,700 undergraduate students with 1,800 living on campus.

#### **8. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Bill Fenimore, Facility Manager for the Phinney Neighborhood Association, owns two houses next to the Wesley Apartments. He mentioned that some of his residents have called to complain about late night noisy behavior by students living in those apartments. He wants SPU to more actively monitor student behavior and deal with it. The alley between the two apartment buildings is also a problem with loud students. He wants the University to enforce an appropriate level of behavior and sound level for students after 10 PM.

Melanie Whitehead responded that students at the Wesley Apartments are required to uphold the same lifestyle expectations as those living in the University's other student housing units in regards to alcohol, noise, etc. Darrell Hines pointed out that the Wesley is not operated by SPU, but is managed on behalf of the University by Lorig Associates, whereas Emerson Hall is operated by the University and has a Residence Life Coordinator on-site. There are two assistant managers that live on-site at The Wesley - one in each building. He said that SPU will continue to work with the manager of The Wesley to ensure that the students are aware of the need to be more considerate of their next door neighbors. Hopefully with a new manager at the Wesley Apartments the students will be more mindful of their neighbors. Dave Church recommended that Bill Fenimore's tenants call SPU Security when behavior or noise issues arise that need to be addressed immediately.

Darlene Hickman mentioned that if there are no pressing issues, there may be no need for a meeting in October.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:25 PM.